

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider Policy and Implementation Refinements to the Energy Storage Procurement Framework and Design Program (D.13-10-040, D.14-10-045) and Related Action Plan of the California Energy Storage Roadmap.

Rulemaking 15-03-011
(Filed March 26, 2015)

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION CLAIM
TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL
CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 16-01-032**

Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network	For contribution to Decision (D.) 16-01-032
Claimed: \$37,575.84	Awarded: \$37,575.84
Assigned Commissioner: Carla J. Peterman	Assigned ALJ: Regina M. DeAngelis

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	<p>D.16-01-032 addresses energy storage policy and program issues that must be resolved prior to commencement of the investor-owned utilities' (IOU) 2016 energy storage procurement solicitations. D.16-01-032:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Approves the investor-owned utilities' request for additional flexibility of energy storage targets between grid domains. The Commission allows the IOUs to satisfy some of their transmission and distribution domain targets through customer-connected projects, up to a "ceiling" of 200% of the existing customer domain targets. 2) Denies the requests for modifications to the Request for Offer process to require additional specificity regarding operational need or location. 3) Clarifies that DC-based storage used as part of a DC microgrid is an eligible storage product for purposes of meeting the storage targets established in Decision (D.) 13-10-040 and the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 2514 (Skinner, 2010), but finds that hydrogen-based power-to-gas option (P2G) is ineligible to meet the storage targets established in D.13-10-040 and the requirements of AB 2514 when injected into the natural gas pipeline.
--	---

	<p>4) Finds that credit for SGIP-funded energy storage projects should be split evenly between an unbundled customer's IOU and the Community Choice Aggregation/Energy Service Provider for purposes of meeting the storage targets.</p> <p>5) Finds that voluntary energy storage deployments should count towards the storage target established for that customer's Load Serving Entity.</p> <p>6) Extends the authorization of the Power Charge Indifference Adjustment mechanism to recover potential above-market costs associated with departing load for market/"bundled" energy storage services procured via the 2016 solicitation.</p> <p>7) Defers the resolution of the request for extension of the Power Charge Indifference Adjustment (PCIA) mechanism for market/"bundled" energy storage contracts beyond 10 years until the Commission has addressed the Joint IOU PCIA Protocol, filed with the applications for approval of contracts resulting from the 2014 storage solicitation process.</p>
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	May 20, 2015	Verified.
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	June 19, 2015	Verified.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes, The Utility Reform Network (TURN) timely filed the notice of intent to claim intervenor compensation.
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.14-05-001	Verified.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	Sept. 5, 2014	Verified.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		

8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes, TURN demonstrated appropriate status.
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.14-05-001	Verified.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	Sept. 5, 2014	Verified.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes, TURN demonstrated significant financial hardship.
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.16-01-032	Verified.
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	Jan. 29, 2016	Verified.
15. File date of compensation request:	Mar. 29, 2016	Verified.
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes, TURN timely filed the request for intervenor compensation.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a), and D.98-04-059).**

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<u>Procurement Best Practices</u> TURN demonstrated that there is no need for changes to the IOUs' storage procurement processes, including specifically valuing potential "new value streams" where the value is uncertain or unquantifiable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D.16-01-032, pp. 13, 15-16 TURN Track 1 Cmts on WS Rpt, 10/2/15, pp. 1-2; <i>See also</i> D.16-01-032, pp. 11-12 (summarizing TURN’s position) TURN Track 1 Reply Cmts on PD, 1/11/16, pp. 1-2 	Verified.
<u>Procurement Best Practices</u> TURN demonstrated that the Commission’s guidance should address the valuation of “revenue streams” rather than “value streams,” because the latter could be understood to include non-monetary “values.”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D.16-01-032, p. 16 (using TURN’s “revenue streams” terminology rather than Stem’s “value streams”) TURN Track 1 Reply Cmts on PD, 1/11/16, pp. 1-2 	Verified.

<p><u>Refinement of the Consistent Evaluation Protocol (CEP)</u></p> <p>TURN demonstrated that the CEP should not be modified at this time to attempt to evaluate GHG emissions reductions benefits associated with specific storage projects, and related, that the IOUs should not be required to rank bids based on estimated GHG reduction impacts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.16-01-032, p. 22 • TURN Track 1 Reply Cmts, 8/3/15, pp. 3-4 • TURN Reply Cmts on Track 1 Combined Workshop Report, 10/9/15, p. 2 	Verified.
<p><u>Refinement of the Consistent Evaluation Protocol (CEP)</u></p> <p>TURN contributed to the Commission's determination that CEP information must be treated consistently with the Commission's procurement confidentiality policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.16-01-032, p. 23 • TURN Reply Cmts on Track 1 Combined Workshop Report, 10/9/15, p. 3 	Verified.
<p><u>Flexibility of Energy Procurement Targets Between Grid Domains</u></p> <p>TURN demonstrated that the Commission should modify the procurement framework to add some degree of flexibility to the customer grid domain targets. Specifically, the customer grid domain targets should operate as a "floor," but not a "ceiling," thus allowing the IOUs to satisfy some amount of their transmission and distribution grid domain MW targets through customer-connected projects (in other words, to move MWs into the customer domain). The Commission adopted TURN's proposed "ceiling" on the number of MWs that will count towards the aggregate storage targets equal to 200% of the current customer grid domain targets for the IOUs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.16-01-032, pp. 32-33 • TURN Track 1 Reply Cmts, 8/3/15, pp. 5-6; see also Table 1, p. 7 (adopted by the Commission as D.16-01-032, Table 1, p. 33) • TURN Track 1 Reply Cmts on PD, 1/11/16, pp. 2-4 	Verified.
<p><u>Energy Storage Target Tracking for CCAs and ESPs</u></p> <p>TURN demonstrated that credit for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.16-01-032, pp. 43-44 • TURN Track 1 Reply Cmts, 8/3/15, pp. 10-12 	Verified.

SGIP-funded projects should be split evenly (50/50) between an unbundled customer's IOU and CCA/ESP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TURN Track 1 Reply Cmts on PD, 1/11/16, pp. 4-5 	
<u>Energy Storage Target Tracking for CCAs and ESPs</u> TURN contributed to the Commission's conclusion that customers should not retain "storage credit," because such a policy would be administratively complex and would likely increase costs and decrease efficiency.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D.16-01-032, p. 44-45 TURN Track 1 Reply Cmts, 8/3/15, p. 13 	Verified.
<u>Cost Recovery/PCIA</u> TURN contributed to the Commission's determination that it is appropriate to authorize the IOUs to seek PCIA treatment for contracts resulting from future solicitations, but also that the burden to demonstrate the reasonableness of PCIA for any specific storage project should remain with the IOUs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D.16-01-032, pp. 48-49 (adopting TURN's reasoning for continuing the PCIA policies, adopted in D.14-10-045, almost verbatim) TURN Track 1 Reply Cmts, 8/3/15, pp. 16-17 	Verified.

B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Verified.
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Verified.
c. If so, provide name of other parties: TURN's positions overlapped to modest degrees with several parties, including the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA), the utilities, and the CCA Parties.		Verified.
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: TURN, as a general matter, offered unique positions in Track 1 of this proceeding, and/or unique analysis in support those positions. For instance, TURN offered a unique approach to increasing flexibility with regard to the customer grid domain targets, which was adopted by the Commission. Likewise, TURN offered a unique		Agreed, TURN did not engage in duplicative participation.

approach to allocating credit for SGIP projects undertaken by unbundled customers between the IOU and CCA/ESP, which the Commission adopted. While TURN's position overlapped to some extent with the utilities on the PCIA issues, the Commission adopted TURN's rationale. Similarly, TURN's position on the challenges of attempting to evaluate GHG emissions reductions benefits associated with specific storage projects aligned with other parties, such as ORA, but TURN offered unique analysis illustrating some of the key issues that vex GHG forecasting efforts, particularly the time-varying nature of GHG emissions and the potential for reducing over-generation by incurring storage losses. (See TURN Cmts on Track 1 Workshop Report, 10/2/15, pp. 3-4, and TURN Track 1 Reply Cmts, 8/3/15, Attachment 1).

In a proceeding such as this where many stakeholder groups participate, some degree of duplication may be practically unavoidable.¹ TURN and other parties at times supported overlapping recommendations, but TURN's compensation in this proceeding should not be reduced for duplication of the showings of other parties. Moreover, in those instances, TURN sought to bolster support for the proposal by emphasizing distinct facts or authority to support the recommendation, to the extent practicable. Accordingly, TURN respectfully submits that the Commission should find that there was no undue duplication, as any duplication served to materially supplement, complement or contribute to the showing of another party and, therefore, is fully compensable under PU Code Section 1802.5. Hence, the Commission should not reduce TURN's award of compensation due to duplication.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):

a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:	CPUC Discussion
<p>TURN's request for intervenor compensation seeks an award of approximately \$36,000 as the reasonable cost of our participation in this proceeding. TURN submits that these costs are reasonable in light of the importance of the issues TURN addressed and the benefits to customers.</p> <p>TURN's advocacy reflected in D.16-01-032 addressed policy matters related to the Commission's Energy Storage Procurement program, rather than specific rates</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

¹ See, i.e. D.96-08-040 (67 CPUC 2d 562, 575-576.X)("[B]ecause of the extraordinary level of participation required of both parties and intervenors throughout these proceedings, we find that a reduction in the amount awarded to intervenors based on duplication of effort is unwarranted. Section 1803(b) requires that the awarding of fees to intervenors "be administered in a manner that encourages the effective and efficient participation of all groups that have a stake in the public utility regulation process." Each of the intervenor groups clearly has a stake in the process of restructuring California's electrical services industry and we are grateful for their participation in these proceedings. Moreover, we rely on them to continue their effective and efficient participation in our proceedings as we move forward with the many implementation tasks ahead. [footnote omitted][¶] . . . In a broad, multi-issue proceeding such as this, we expect to see some duplication of contribution. This duplication does not diminish the value of that contribution to the Commission. In our view, to deduct from an award of reasonable fees in this case would not encourage the effective and efficient participation of all stakeholders in the spirit of § 1801.3(b).")

<p>or disputes over particular dollar amounts. In an effort to ensure appropriate Commission oversight of the new program and minimize the risk of market dysfunction, TURN specifically focused procurement best practices and the related issue of whether refinements to the CEP are appropriate, and also on the extent to which the Commission should increase flexibility in how the targets are met across grid domains. TURN additionally addressed “credit allocation” and cost allocation to ensure that all residential ratepayers, as well as the subset of bundled residential customers, are asked to bear an equitable portion of the costs of the new program. TURN cannot easily identify precise monetary benefits to ratepayers from our work in this proceeding, given the nature of the issues presented.</p> <p>However, in a proceeding as this, which was heavily dominated by utilities, energy storage industry parties, generators, and direct access (including CCA) interests, TURN represented the otherwise relatively under-represented interests of residential ratepayers. Despite the lack of easily quantifiable customer benefits, TURN submits that its positive impact on the Commission’s policies regarding the Energy Storage Procurement program in this proceeding will afford the ratepayers of PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E significant benefits, as the establishment of energy policies has a direct and lasting impact on customer rates.</p> <p>As such, the Commission should treat this compensation request as it has treated similar past requests with regard to the difficulty of establishing specific monetary benefits associated with TURN’s participation (or that of another intervenor). (See, e.g. D.13-12-027, p. 11 (awarding Sierra Club California intervenor compensation for energy storage policy work in R.10-12-007); D.15-07-028, p.7 (awarding TURN intervenor compensation for energy storage policy work in A.14-02-006 et al.).)²</p> <p>For all of these reasons, the Commission should find that TURN's efforts have been productive.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours and direct expenses claimed:</p> <p>This Request for Compensation includes approximately 49 hours of TURN’s</p>	<p>Verified, but see CPUC Disallowances and</p>

² See also D.99-12-005 at 6-7 (Compensation Decision in 1995 Storm Phase of PG&E GRC, A.97-12-020) and D.00-04-006 at 9-10 (Compensation Decision in Edison PBR Midterm Review, A.99-03-020) (recognizing the overall benefit of TURN’s participation where that participation assisted the Commission in developing a record on which to assess the reasonableness of the utility’s operations, and particularly its preparedness and performance in the future); D.00-05-022 (Compensation Decision in the Emergency Standards Proceeding) (awarding TURN \$92,000 in D.00-10-014 for our substantial contribution to the earlier decision, despite TURN’s inability to assign a dollar value to the benefit of our participation in order to demonstrate “productivity.” Interestingly, the Commission awarded compensation even though the emergency restoration standards may never come into play in the future, since they come into play only after a “major outage,” which is defined as impacting more than 10% of a utility’s customers. The contingent nature of the future standards did not cause the Commission to hesitate in awarding TURN compensation.).

<p>attorney time, 40 hours of TURN's in-house energy analyst's time, and 62 hours of expert consultant time. TURN's efforts reflected herein resulted in numerous contributions to D.16-01-032, detailed above, and encompass the preparation of seven formal filings by TURN, informal feedback submitted to the IOUs on their proposed "Joint IOU Protocol for Energy Storage PCIA" in accordance with the process set forth in D.14-10-045, plus active participation at the PHC and in the full-day workshop held on July 28, 2015.</p> <p><u>TURN Staff and Consultant Hours</u></p> <p>TURN assigned this proceeding to staff attorney Hayley Goodson and energy analyst Eric Borden. Ms. Goodson, who previously represented TURN in A.14-02-006 et al., brought her prior experience with the Commission's energy storage procurement program to this proceeding. Mr. Borden joined TURN in February 2015, just before the Commission opened this proceeding. Given his prior experience working on energy storage issues -- including research on renewable energy integration and energy storage in Germany and consulting work with the International Renewable Energy Agency on the use of battery storage for renewable integration -- Mr. Borden was a welcome addition to TURN's team.</p> <p>TURN also relied on outside expert consultants Kevin Woodruff of Woodruff Expert Services, and to a very limited extent, Bill Marcus of JBS Energy. Mr. Woodruff assisted TURN in R.10-12-007 and A.14-02-006 et al., the two predecessor proceedings to the instant docket, and has extensive experience with energy procurement, renewable procurement, LTTP, and resource adequacy issues. As such, his input was critical in shaping TURN's positions in this proceeding. Mr. Marcus, who has decades of experience with cost allocation and cost recovery of utility investments, assisted TURN with a limited PCIA-related issue in this proceeding.</p> <p>Ms. Goodson worked diligently to coordinate work assigned to Mr. Borden and Mr. Woodruff so as to avoid duplication of effort. For instance, at the Track 1 workshops, Mr. Woodruff took the lead on GHG modeling issues related to the CEP, while Mr. Borden focused on procurement best practices and other CEP issues. Similarly, in each of the pleadings worked on by both experts, Mr. Borden and Mr. Woodruff took the lead on drafting different sections. Ms. Goodson oversaw their work and additionally took the lead on other issues. Because each expert offered unique expertise, TURN's showing benefited from the input of Mr. Borden and Mr. Woodruff, as well as Ms. Goodson's management of the case to ensure the efficient production of thoughtful -- and ultimately persuasive -- work product.</p> <p>TURN submits that the Commission should find the hours requested here to be reasonable under the circumstances, and that TURN's showing supports that conclusion. However, should the Commission believe that more information is needed or that a different approach to discussing the reasonableness of the requested hours is warranted here, TURN requests the opportunity to supplement this section of the request.</p>	Adjustments, below.
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>TURN has allocated its daily time entries by activity codes to better reflect the</p>	Verified.

nature of the work reflected in each entry. TURN has used the following activity codes:

Code	Description	Allocation of Time
Track1-Proc	Work related to the Consistent Evaluation Protocol and Procurement Best Practices	24.4%
Track1-Flex	Work related to flexibility among grid domains	6.3%
Track1-Credit	Work related to assigning credit for customer storage projects to ESPs, CCAs, and IOUs	4.3%
Track1-PCIA	Work related to the PCIA issues addressed in the Track 1 decision	3.5%
PCIA-JIP	Work related to the Draft "Joint IOU Protocol for Energy Storage PCIA"	9.8%
Track1-#	Work related to multiple substantive issue areas that is not easily allocated to specific issues.	11.0%
Track1-WS	Work related to participation in the Commission's Track 1 workshops in this proceeding (where such work was not related to a specific issue).	7.0%
Track1-PD	This work was related to the Proposed Decision preceding D.16-01-032 where not easily allocated to specific issue areas	10.0%
Track1-GP	The work in this category includes activities associated with general participation in this proceeding.	14.3%
Track1-Travel	Travel time incurred by Kevin Woodruff to travel from his Sacramento office to the CPUC to be on a Workshop Panel	1.3%
Track1-Comp	Intervenor Compensation: work preparing the Notice of Intent and Request for Compensation	8.1%
TOTAL		100.0%

If the Commission believes that a different approach to issue-specific allocation is warranted here, TURN requests the opportunity to supplement this section of the request.

B. Specific Claim:**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hour s	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$ [A]	Total \$
Hayley Goodson, TURN	2015	29.50	\$355	D.15-08-023 (adopting 2014 rate of \$355).	\$10,472.50	29.50	\$355	\$10,472.50

Attorney				adjusted by the 2015 0% COLA per Resolution ALJ-308				
Hayley Goodson, TURN Attorney	2016	7.00	\$355	Apply 2015 requested rate of \$355; do not adopt as 2016 rate.	\$2,485.00	7.00	\$355.	\$2,485.00
Eric Borden, TURN Energy Analyst	2015	35.50	\$180	See Section III, Part C, Comment 2	\$6,390.00	35.50	\$180	\$6,390.00
Eric Borden, TURN Energy Analyst	2016	4.75	\$180	Apply 2015 requested rate of \$180; do not adopt as 2016 rate.	\$855.00	4.75	\$180	\$855.00
Kevin Woodruff, Woodruff Expert Services	2015	51.00	\$250	Actual rate charged by Mr. Woodruff; also equivalent to D.12-11-050 (adopting 2012 rate of \$240), adjusted by the 2013 2% COLA per Res. ALJ-287, plus the 2014 2.56% COLA per Res. ALJ-303, rounded to nearest \$5	\$12,750.00	51.00	\$250	\$12,750.00
Kevin Woodruff, Woodruff Expert Services	2016	8.00	\$250	Same rate requested for 2015	\$2,000.00	8.00	\$250	\$2,000.00
Bill Marcus, JBS Energy, Inc.	2015	0.58	\$270	Apply 2014 rate of \$270 adopted in D.15-08-023; do not adopt as 2015 rate.	\$156.60	0.58	\$270	\$156.60
Subtotal: \$35,109.10						Subtotal: \$35,109.10		

OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Travel Time for Kevin Woodruff's travel from Sacramento to the CPUC to be on a workshop panel	2015	2.00	\$125	1/2 of requested hourly rate for 2015	\$250.00	2.00	\$125	\$250.00
Subtotal: \$250.00						Subtotal: \$250.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Hayley Goodson, TURN Attorney	2015	1.00	\$177.50	1/2 of requested hourly rate for 2015	\$177.50	1	\$177.50	\$177.50
Hayley Goodson, TURN Attorney	2016	11.25	\$177.50	1/2 of requested hourly rate for 2015	\$1,996.88	11.25	\$177.50	\$ 1,996.88
Subtotal: \$2,174.38						Subtotal: \$2,174.38		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
	Copies	Copies of filings and documents related to D.16-01-032			\$16.20	\$16.20		
	Phone	Phone calls related to D.16-01-032			\$6.42	\$6.42		
	Postage	Mailing costs for filings related to D.16-01-032			\$19.74	\$19.74		
Subtotal: \$42.36						Subtotal: \$42.36		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$37,575.84						TOTAL AWARD: \$37,575.84		
<p>**We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor's records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.</p>								

ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ³	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility
Hayley Goodson	December 05, 2003	228535	No

C. Intervenor's Comment(s):

Comment #	TURN's Comment(s)
Comment 1	<p>Hourly Rates for TURN Attorney Hayley Goodson</p> <p><u>2015</u></p> <p>For Ms. Goodson's work in 2015, TURN seeks an hourly rate of \$355. This rate reflects the application of the 2015 COLA adopted in Resolution ALJ-308 (0%) to the rate the Commission adopted for Ms. Goodson's work in 2014 in D.15-08-023.</p> <p><u>2016</u></p> <p>Given the relatively small number of hours incurred by Ms. Goodson in 2016 related to D.16-01-032, TURN seeks only the hourly rate requested for 2015 (\$355) for these hours. TURN asks that the Commission NOT treat the decision on this compensation request as setting a 2016 hourly rate for Ms. Goodson, as TURN will seek and justify an actual 2016 hourly rate for her in a future compensation request.</p>
Comment 2	<p>Hourly Rates for TURN Energy Analyst Eric Borden</p> <p><u>2015</u></p> <p>For Mr. Borden's work in 2015, TURN seeks an hourly rate of \$180. This is the first time TURN has requested an hourly rate for Mr. Borden, who joined TURN's staff in February 2015.⁴ Mr. Borden's complete resume is attached as Attachment 5 to this compensation request.</p> <p>Mr. Borden holds a Bachelor of Science in Finance and a Master of Public Affairs, specializing in Natural Resources and the Environment. He spent three years in the field of litigation consulting, conducting financial and accounting modeling and writing reports supporting expert witnesses in disputes over intellectual property and energy utilities. During graduate school, Mr. Borden conducted academic research on electric vehicle policy, and worked professionally conducting research on renewable energy costs, clean energy technologies and social entrepreneurship. TURN submits that his work experience during this period should be deemed the equivalent of one full year of additional professional experience for purposes here. Following graduate school, Mr. Borden was awarded a German Chancellor Fellowship to conduct research on renewable energy integration and energy storage in Germany, lasting for about 1.5 years. Subsequently, Mr. Borden worked for 1.5 years as an energy analyst with a</p>

³ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

⁴ TURN presented this same showing in a compensation request filed on March 25, 2016, in A.14-10-014.

	<p>consulting firm analyzing the financial profitability of Combined Heat and Power systems in different utility jurisdictions, and as a consultant with the International Renewable Energy Agency writing a report on the use of battery storage for renewable integration. By the time Mr. Borden joined TURN in February 2015, he had the equivalent of seven years of professional experience in financial modeling, utility tariff analysis, and research and publications on topics in the energy field.</p> <p>Given the length and direct relevance of his professional experience to the issues before the Commission, TURN requests that the Commission authorize an hourly rate of \$180/hour for 2015 for Mr. Borden. Such a rate is near the bottom of the 2015 range for 7-12 years of experience (\$170-\$285) (and just above the mid-point of the \$140-\$200 range established for consultants with 0-6 years experience). It is comparable to hourly rates adopted for experts with similar training and experience (for example: Heather Cooley for Surfrider Foundation -- \$175 for 2009 work in D.11-05-017; Michael Brown for Small Business Utility Advocates -- \$185 for 2013 work in D.15-06-016). Even if the Commission calculates his relevant experience differently to reach a lower figure, the requested rate is well within the \$140-\$200 range established for consultants with 0-6 years of experience. For these reasons, TURN submits that \$180 is a reasonable hourly rate for an expert of Mr. Borden's experience. As such, the Commission should find reasonable the requested hourly rate of \$180.</p> <p><u>2016</u></p> <p>Given the relatively small number of hours incurred by Mr. Borden in 2016 related to D.16-01-032, TURN seeks only the hourly rate requested for 2015 (\$180) for these hours. TURN asks that the Commission NOT treat the decision on this compensation request as setting a 2016 hourly rate for Mr. Borden, as TURN will seek and justify an actual 2016 hourly rate for him in a future compensation request.</p>
Comment 3	<p>2015 Hourly Rate for Kevin Woodruff, Woodruff Expert Services</p> <p>For Mr. Woodruff's work in 2015, TURN seeks an hourly rate of \$250. This is the actual rate charged by Mr. Woodruff to TURN as of January 1, 2015. TURN notes that a rate of \$250 is also equivalent to the rate that would result from adjusting Mr. Woodruff's previously authorized 2012 rate of \$240 by the 2013 COLA of 2% and the 2014 COLA of 2.58%, and rounding the result to the nearest \$5. <i>See</i> D.12-11-050 (Mr. Woodruff's 2012 rate); Res. ALJ-287 (2013 COLA); Res. ALJ-303 (2014 COLA).</p> <p>Mr. Woodruff has not raised his hourly rate charged to TURN since January 1, 2015. As such, TURN does not seek to establish a higher hourly rate for his work related to D.16-01-032 in 2016.</p>
Comment 4	<p>2015 Hourly Rate for William B. Marcus, JBS Energy</p> <p>On January 1, 2015, JBS Energy, Inc. increased the hourly rates for its firm members, including William Marcus. Given the extremely small number of hours incurred by Mr. Marcus in 2015 related to D.16-01-032, merely 0.58 hours, TURN seeks only the previously authorized 2014 rate of \$270 for those hours. <i>See</i> D.15-08-023. TURN asks that the Commission NOT treat the decision on this compensation request as setting a 2015 hourly rate for Mr. Marcus, as TURN will seek and justify an actual 2015 hourly rate for him in a future compensation request.</p>

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
[A]	The Commission respects TURN's request to not apply the 2016 Cost-of-Living-Adjustment (COLA) adopted in Resolution ALJ-329.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No.
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. TURN has made a substantial contribution to D.16-01-032.
2. The requested hourly rates for Intervenor's representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$37,575.84.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. The Utility Reform Network shall be awarded \$37,575.84.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional gas and electric revenues for the 2015 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning June 12, 2016 the 75th day after the

filing of The Utility Reform Network's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1601032		
Proceeding(s):	R1503011		
Author:	ALJ DeAngelis		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	3/29/2016	\$37,575.84	\$37,575.84	N/A	See CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, above.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	TURN	\$355	2015	\$355
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	TURN	\$355	2016	\$355
Eric	Borden	Expert	TURN	\$180	2015	\$180
Eric	Borden	Expert	TURN	\$180	2016	\$180
Kevin	Woodruff	Expert	TURN	\$250	2015	\$250
Kevin	Woodruff	Expert	TURN	\$250	2016	\$250
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$270	2015	\$270

(END OF APPENDIX)